



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,536	07/16/2003	Jean-Marc Vandoorne-Feys	BOCK-04/119	8449

26875 7590 02/24/2005

WOOD, HERRON & EVANS, LLP
2700 CAREW TOWER
441 VINE STREET
CINCINNATI, OH 45202

EXAMINER

O MALLEY, KATHRYN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3749

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/620,536	Applicant(s) VANDOORNE-FEYS, JEAN-MARC	
	Examiner Kathryn S. O'Malley	Art Unit 3749	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/14/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,778,703 to Imai et al.
3. Imai et al. teaches a dryer with a rotary drum 4 with a drive comprising a motor 17, wherein at least one embodiment of the dryer has at least 30 poles. Note column 6, lines 42-46; column 14, lines 38-41; and Figure 2.
4. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,207,764 to Akabane et al.
5. Akabane et al. teaches a dryer with rotary drum 12 driven by motor 13 wherein drum 12 is coupled to motor 13 via a single transmission belt 37, and the drum can be rotated at speeds as low as 50 revolutions per minute. Note column 10, lines 26-44; column 14, lines 7-10; and Figure 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imai et al. as applied to claim 1 above.

8. The dryer of Imai et al. does not require a transmission. However, Imai et al. teaches that the use of a single belt transmission with a reducing mechanism to couple a motor with a rotatable drum is well known in the art. Note column 1, lines 24-27. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the motor with at least ten poles taught by Imai et al. to drive a dryer having a single, reducing transmission that couples the motor to a rotatable drum.

9. Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imai et al. as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Akabane et al. as applied to claim 9 above.

10. Imai et al. does not suggest coupling a motor to a rotatable drum via a direct transmission. Belt transmission 37 of Akabane et al. provides direct transmission between drum 12 and motor 13. As the direct transmission of Akabane et al. requires less parts, such as no reducing mechanism, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the transmission with reducing mechanism taught by Imai et al. with the direct transmission taught by Akabane et al.

11. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imai et al. as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of US Patent 6,531,801 to Blazek et al.

12. Imai et al. does not define his motor to be asynchronous. However, as Blazek et al. teaches that asynchronous motors are conventionally used to rotate the drum of a

Art Unit: 3749

clothes machine (note column 2, lines 9-23), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use an asynchronous motor in the machine of Imai et al.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kathryn S. O'Malley whose telephone number is (571)272-4879. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ira Lazarus can be reached on (703)308-1935. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KSO


DENISE L. ESQUIVEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700